

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the Application is respectfully requested.

I. Claim Status

Claims 1-7, 9, and 10 are currently pending. Claims 8 and 11-20 have been canceled. Claims 1 and 9 have been amended. Support for these amendments come from the Applicant's published specification at paragraphs [0043], [0044], and [0048]. No new matter has been added.

II. Claim Rejections

Claims 1-4 and 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gelderie et al. (U.S. 6,479,155) in view of Triebel et al. (U.S. 4, 201, 828).

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gelderie et al. (U.S. 6,479,155) in view of Suzuki et al. (U.S. 6,042,928).

The Examiner contends that Gelderie discloses a laminated glass film comprising intermediate layers consisting of different materials including polyvinyl butyral (PVB) and fluorinated hydrocarbons (THV). The Examiner notes that Gelderie does not disclose an adhesive that bonds the layers together. The Examiner contends that Triebel teaches a glass laminate where the individual layers are connected by an adhesive layer of polyvinyl butyral. The Examiner states that Suzuki discloses a glass laminate having a silane coupling agent to bond the layers together. The Examiner contends that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include Triebel's PVB adhesive layers to bond the glass laminate layers of Gelderie and to include the silane coupling adhesive layers of Suzuki to create the Applicant's invention.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 8 has been canceled and Examiner's rejection is moot.

Claims 1 and 9 have been amended to include at least one polyvinyl butyral film and at least one fluorine resin film of a tetrafluoroethylene-hexafluoropropylene-vinylidene fluoride ternary copolymer. The fluorine resin film is bonded to the adjacent polyvinyl butyral film using an adhesive to which a silane coupling agent is added.

Gelderie relates to a fire-resistant laminated glass pane assembly in which a silicate glass pane is joined to each of two faces of a glass-ceramic pane by means of a transparent intermediate layer. Gelderie discloses that the intermediate layers may be formed of PVB or THV and that the intermediate layers are formed of different materials from each other. However, Gelderie does not disclose that each intermediate layer may comprise multiple layers of different materials.

In the laminated glass pane assembly of Gelderie, when one of the intermediate layers is formed of PVB and the other intermediate layer is formed of THV, the glass-ceramic pane is located between the PVB layer and the THV layer. Accordingly, although the combination of Gelderie with Triebel or with Suzuki, which discloses that two layers adjacent to each other are joined together using an adhesive, might allow a person skilled in the art to conceive to join the PVB layer and the THV layer of Gelderie to the glass-ceramic pane using an adhesive, but such combination does not allow a person skilled in the art to easily conceive to join the PVB layer and the THV layer to each other using an adhesive. Furthermore, none of the cited references teach the advantage of the present invention of providing a laminated resin film which can be suitably used as an interlayer film of a laminated glass having both good fire resistance and crime prevention properties.

Therefore, independent claims 1 and 9 as amended and the dependent claims thereof are not obvious over Gelderie in view of Triebel or in view of Suzuki. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1-7 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 10 – 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gelderie et al. (U.S. 6,479,155) in view of Triebel et al. (U.S. 4, 201, 828) further in view of Karschti et al. (U.S. 6,770,375). Claim 10 is not obvious in view of the references under the same arguments as above and claims 11-18 have been canceled, making the Examiner's rejection moot. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gelderie et al. (U.S. 6,479,155) in view of Triebel et al. (U.S. 4, 201, 828) in view of Karschti et al. (U.S. 6,770,375) further in view of Gutweiler et al. (U.S. 5,384,346). Claims 19-20 have been canceled, making the Examiner's rejection moot.

Claims 10 – 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gelderie et al. (U.S. 6,479,155) in view of Suzuki et al. (U.S. 6,042,928) further in view of Karschti et al. (U.S. 6,770,375). Claim 10 is not obvious in view of the same arguments as above and claims 11-18 have been canceled, making the Examiner's rejection moot. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gelderie et al. (U.S. 6,479,155) in view of Suzuki et al. (U.S. 6,042,928) in view of Karschti et al. (U.S. 6,770,375) further in view of Gutweiler et al. (U.S. 5,384,346). Claims 19-20 have been canceled, making the Examiner's rejection moot.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants believes the pending application is in condition for allowance. If there are any remaining issues which the Examiner believes could be resolved through either a Supplemental Response or an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any deficiency or credit any excess in this fee to Deposit Account No. 04-0100.

Dated: November 7, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By

Louis J. DeJuidice

Registration No.: 47,522

DARBY & DARBY P.C.

P.O. Box 770

Church Street Station

New York, New York 10008-0770

(212) 527-7700

(212) 527-7701 (Fax)

Attorneys/Agents For Applicants